



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,568	09/30/2003	Timothy J. Daniel	BUCKFELLER 17-4-2-4	9978
47396	7590	01/25/2007		
HITT GAINES, PC AGERE SYSTEMS INC. PO BOX 832570 RICHARDSON, TX 75083			EXAMINER MOORE, KARLA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1763	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,568

Applicant(s)

DANIEL ET AL.

Examiner

Karla Moore

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,8,9 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,8,9 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,841,624 to Xu et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,106,630 to Frankel and U.S. Patent No. 6,146,504 to Patadia et al.

4. Xu et al. disclose a physical vapor deposition chamber (not illustrated, but mentioned at column 1, rows 13-17 and column 8, rows 28-30) for depositing material on a wafer (120) substantially as claimed and comprising: a chuck (Figure 1, 110), wherein the chuck comprises a planar upper surface (112) and sidewalls extending downwardly therefrom; a removable pedestal cover (100) overlying the planar upper surface of the chuck, the removable pedestal cover having a first planar surface (contacting the substrate) and a second planar surface (contacting the chuck) located below the first surface; and wherein a planar backside of the wafer is in contact with the planar upper surface of the pedestal cover. Admittedly, the pedestal cover of Xu et al. does not comprise a singular, continuous, planar upper surface in the region

Art Unit: 1763

overlying the chuck, but a plurality of intermittent planar upper surfaces in the region overlying the chuck.

The cover is chemically removable (column 5, rows 41-46).

5. Xu et al. disclose the chamber substantially as claimed and as described above.

6. However, Xu et al. fail to teach the pedestal cover extending laterally beyond the sidewalls.

7. Frankel discloses a pedestal cover for both top and side surfaces (i.e. all exposed surfaces) of a chuck for the purpose of protecting all of the areas most susceptible to processing gases (column 10, row 24, through column 11, row 15). In Frankel, the lower surface of the pedestal cover is concave and completely receives the chuck therein during a processing method, such as material deposition.

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided the pedestal cover in Xu et al. extending beyond chuck side walls (i.e. covering all exposed surfaces) in order to protect all areas of the chuck most susceptible to processing gas as taught by Frankel.

9. Xu et al. and Frankel disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

10. However, Xu et al. and Frankel fail to teach the pedestal cover defining a peripheral circumferential groove therein in an upper surface of the second surface, wherein a circumference of the wafer extends radially inwardly of the groove.

11. Patadia et al. disclose providing a peripheral (with respect to the substrate) circumferential deposit collection channel on a substrate supporting device for the purpose of trapping deposit particles that do not deposit on the substrate thus preventing deposition and sticking on the backside of a processed substrate (abstract). In Patadia, a circumference of the wafer extends radially inwardly of an inner sidewall (124) of the groove. This is necessary; otherwise, the purpose of the groove (collecting material) would not be achieved.

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided a peripheral circumferential groove on the substrate supporting device wherein a circumference of the wafer extends radially inwardly of an inner sidewall of the groove in Xu et al. and Frankel in order to trap deposit particles that do not deposit on the substrate thus preventing deposition and sticking on the backside of a processed substrate as taught by Patadia et al.

Art Unit: 1763

13. With respect to claims 2 and 5, Xu et al. further teaches that the pedestal cover further comprises a plurality of pads (102) on an upper surface thereof, such that the wafer may be disposed on the plurality of pads.

14. With respect to claim 4, the Patadia et al. teach that the design and dimensions of the groove are optimized for collection of material and minimization of backside deposition. Specific dimensions would be chosen based on these objectives. The courts have ruled that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

15. With respect to claim 9, Examiner notes that the limitations are drawn to a method of using the apparatus and the courts have ruled that a claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). Examiner notes that Xu et al. also teach these method limitations at column 4, rows 17-19.

16. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu et al., Frankel and Patadia et al. as applied to claims 1-2, 4-5 and 9 above, and further in view Applicant's admitted prior art.

17. Xu et al., Frankel and Patadia et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

18. However, Xu et al., Frankel and Patadia et al. fail to teach an aluminum deposition target.

19. Applicant's admitted prior art teaches that aluminum targets are conventionally used in integrated circuit device manufacture (paragraphs 4-6 of specification).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided an aluminum deposition target in Xu et al., Frankel and Patadia et al. in order to perform integrated circuit device manufacture as is conventionally done as taught in the admitted prior art.

21. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu et al., Frankel and Patadia et al. as applied to claims 1-2, 4-5 and 9 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,656,093 to Burkhart et al.

22. Xu et al., Frankel and Patadia et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above.

23. However, while Xu et al. do teach that the pads of the pedestal cover may comprise a conducting material, stainless steel is not explicitly taught as the conducting material.

24. Burkhart et al. teach the use of stainless steel as a material for conducting pads of a pedestal cover for the purpose of using a material having superior contact properties (column 2, rows 15-20).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided the pedestal cover/pads comprising stainless steel in Xu et al., Frankel et al., and Patadia et al. in order to use a material with superior contact properties as taught by Burkhart et al.

Response to Arguments

26. Applicant's arguments filed 6 November been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

27. In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

28. Examiner disagrees with Applicant's contention that the relied upon references fail to teach or fairly suggest the claimed invention and that there is no motivation for combining the advantageous features disclosed in the references (i.e. Xu, Frankel and Patadia). The motivation is detailed in the above rejections, as well as in the response to arguments section of the previous office action. Examiner further notes that the courts have ruled that "the test of obviousness is not whether features of the

Art Unit: 1763

secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the primary reference's structure, nor whether the claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of the references, rather the test is what the combined teachings would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." Ex parte Martin 215 USPQ 543, 544 (PO Bd Pat App 1981). Further, in response to Applicant's argument that the Examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Each of the features that Applicant argues is non-obvious is more than fairly disclosed in the art along with motivation (i.e. advantages obtained by providing such features in a wafer support structure) for providing such features.

Conclusion

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1763

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karla Moore whose telephone number is 571.272.1440. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 am-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571.272.1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Karla Moore
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1763
20 January 2007